PE RILLER

RECEIVED

SEP 2 7 2004

MS AF

Corres. and Mail

Technology Center 260037 C.F.R. \$ 1.146
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

EXAMINING GROUP 2614

PATENT 3313-0315P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Chung-Chih TUNG

Conf.:

6783

Appl. No.:

09/848,376

Group:

2614

Filed:

May 4, 2001

Examiner: TRANG U. TRAN

For:

VIDEO SIGNAL CONVERSATION METHOD

NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM THE PRIMARY EXAMINER TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

MS AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 24, 2004

Sir:

Applicants hereby appeal to the Board of Appeals from the decision dated March 24, 2004 of the Primary Examiner finally rejecting claims 1-17.

This document is being transmitted via the Certificate of Mailing provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.8.

The applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for an extension of three (3) month(s) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a).

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

NO extensions of time have been previously obtained for responding to the Final Rejection. Thus a fee of \$950.00 is required for the <u>full period</u> of the above-requested extension of time.

An extension of ____() month(s) for responding to the Final Rejection was previously requested and paid for on ____. Thus a fee of \$0.00 is required to obtain an additional ____() month(s) for filing the Notice of Appeal.

. 09/27/2004 CCHAU1 00000046 09848376

Adjustment date: 01/24/2005 SDIRETA1 09/27/2004 CCHAU1 00000046 09848376 -330. 01 FC:1401 -950.

RETA1 01 FC:1401 48376 02 FC:1253 -330.00 0P -950.00 0P 330.00 GP 950.00 GP

50/RCF

PATENT 3313-0315P 207 EEC 17 FE 3:56

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Chung-Chin TUNG

Appl. No.:

09/848,376

Group:

2614

Filed:

May 4, 2001

Examiner: Trang TRAN

For:

VIDEO SIGNAL COVERSION METHOD

REQUEST FOR REFUND UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.26

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 December 15, 2004

Sir:

Applicants herewith request a refund in the amount of \$1,280.00, which represents the payment made on September 24, 2004 for a three (3) month extension of time (\$950.00) and a Notice of Appeal (\$330.00). It is requested that this refund be applied to deposit account number 02-2448.

The facts involving this situation are as follows: The Examiner issued a Final rejection on March 24, 2004. Applicants replied to this rejection on June 24, 2004, the final date of the three month shortened statutory period. An Advisory Action was issued in response to this Amendment on November 16, 2004. Thus, the PTO Advisory Action took almost 5 months after the date of filing of the Amendment. Due to this lengthy delay, Applicants needed to Petition to extend the time period for three (3) months to the statutory maximum and then file a Notice of Appeal in order to keep the case alive until the Advisory Action was received.

Docket No. 3313-0315P Page 2

Appl. No. 09/848,376 Apt Unit 2614

Applicants submit that this delay was caused strictly by the Patent Office scanning procedures and was not in any manner of the fault of the Applicant. In fact, Applicants Attorney contacted the Examiner on multiple occasions and even talked to the Examiners supervisor in an attempt to speed the process. Copies of the submitted Amendment were also faxed to the Examiner for the same purpose. In view of this delay which was caused by the Patent Office, Applicants request that the three (3) month extension of time and the Notice of Appeal charges be refunded.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

MM/RFG/te 3313-0315P